

CONCORDIA UNIVERSITYMinutes of the meeting held on Friday, April 4, 1986

PRESENT: C. Bertrand, Chairperson; D. Dicks; G. Valaskakis; P. Albert; F. Shlosser; C. Foster; T. Arbuckle-Maag; V.V. Baba; M. Barlow; A. Broes; D. Brown; W. Byers; A. Costanzo; L. Crysler; M. Doughty; W. Gilsdorf; K. Herrmann; J. Hill; W. Knitter; J. Locke; D. Markiewicz; D. McDougall; J. Ryan; S. Mullett; G. Newsham; M. Oppenheim; R. Pallen; B. Petrie; B. Sahni; W. Sellers; R. Sharma; L. Van Toch; K. Waters; M. Buffone; D. Goldsmith; K. Goral; M. Lange; J.S. Locke; S. Van Breevort; N. Wallace; L. Lapostolle; M. Mendell (representing SCPA).

ABSENT WITH REGRETS: J. Doyle; H. McQueen; D. Shapiro. G. Trudel; N. Dlouhy.

1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 1:35 p.m.

2. Approval of Agenda

86-3-1 It was moved and seconded (Brown/Pallen) to approve the agenda.

Prof. Brown requested that the notice of motion concerning the Classics Department (ASFC 86-3-D4) be put on the agenda. Dean Bertrand replied that that was not a proper procedure, but that the notice could be offered for the next meeting of Council. It then was asked if it could be entered under Item 9 and the Chairperson replied that he did not think it would be a proper motion to introduce under Other Business because it was a more serious matter than would be dealt with under that item.

Prof. Ryan challenged the ruling. He said that at the last meeting the identical motion was accepted under identical circumstances and the only reason it did not appear on the agenda was that it was withdrawn on the basis of the answer made by the Chair.

On a point of information it was asked if the Chair, in ruling in this way, meant that no member of Council could introduce a motion at a meeting of Council on any item that was not on the agenda but must introduce a notice of motion which could then only be entertained at a subsequent meeting.

The Dean replied that that generally has been the practice and he saw no reason to change it. Asked if the members were to support the Chair's ruling would that mean that the issue could not then be discussed at this meeting in any other way he replied that under Item 5 anything could be raised as a question.

It was pointed out that the question being asked was a matter concerning interpretation of what is covered in the Collective

Agreement and Prof. Brown was asked what was the intention of the motion. He replied that the intent of the motion was to have Council discuss the question of the viability of a constituent academic department of the Council and he thought that, notwithstanding the Collective Agreement, it seemed to him to be germane and proper business for the Council of Arts and Science to discuss what would be the minimum viable academic membership of a constituent department.

A vote was taken of those in support of the Chair's decision to rule the item out of order for this meeting and it was carried.

The agenda, as distributed, was approved.

3. Approval of Minutes

86-3-2 It was moved and seconded (Ryan/Petrie) to approve the minutes of the meeting held on March 7, 1986.

It was suggested that the phraseology used in the minutes with regard to the Chair's recount of the answer to the question posed by Prof. Brown at an earlier meeting seemed incomplete as to what had been said; that in addition to having said that the matter would come before Council for its consideration and recommendation, the Chair had also agreed that it would come before the Board of Governors and that he had spoken of "decision" on the part of Faculty Council.

The Dean replied that he did not think that he had mentioned the Board of Governors and if he had, he was wrong. He stated that the closing of a programme has nothing to do with the Board of Governors, but said that he was quite willing to check the tape of the meeting and suggested that the matter be brought up at the next meeting.

The Dean was asked if he did not recall that two meetings ago he was asked whether or not an academic department could be closed without the matter coming before Senate and that his reply was that he did not know but would find out, and at the last meeting he had said that he had found that the matter would have to come before the Senate and before the Board of Governors. Dean Bertrand replied that his assumption was that anything of that nature that comes before Faculty Council automatically goes to Senate and might or might not go to the Board of Governors depending on the issue at hand.

The Dean suggested that the question be asked under Item 5.

Attention was drawn to a number of typographical errors and it was noted that under Item 6 Prof. Mullett's name had been omitted from the list of nominees.

The minutes, as amended, were approved.

4. Chairman's Remarks

The Chairman had no further comments.

5. Questions and Announcements

In reference to a question about the salary increment for faculty, the Dean said that rumours are always difficult to deal with so he was not quite sure what the context was in which the words "will not be paid" were spoken. He said that as he understands it, the issue is very simply that no money can be paid until the Quebec government has finished its negotiations with the public sector and until that happens the salary package isn't going to be clear and a salary package cannot be offered to anybody else until that has been solved; that does not mean that the University will not pay, it simply means that it will not pay until it has the money.

One member noted that the payment has already been made at four Quebec universities. The concern was expressed that the Concordia faculty might be making an accidental donation to the capital fund.

The Dean replied that he did not think that was happening at all. He said that he did not know the basis on which McGill had made the payment, but that it is true that Laval has signed a new contract which, if you read it one way, comes to 7%, but in reality, it is going to be about 4% given the way salary structures are at Laval and is above the government guideline which at the moment is 3.5%. But Laval has a little margin of maneuver to play with that Concordia does not have, so Concordia must wait to give that out. Dean Bertrand added that, to his knowledge, it is not the administration's policy not to pay the money as soon as it becomes available. It is in the Collective Agreement so there is not much of an issue there; it is just a question of when the money comes into the envelope.

Concerning the Library, one member said that he has had some complaints from students which stem from the regulation which allows a student to take out a maximum of thirty books leaving other students unable to find texts for critical studies for their papers. It was asked if the matter was one that

could be dealt with in Council at a future meeting. The Dean replied that that would seem to him to be a perfectly legitimate notice of motion to file with the Steering Committee for the next meeting because it is the kind of thing that the Council could debate and send a recommendation to Senate much as the periodical business was straightened out by starting out at Faculty Council.

One member raised a question which he said was pertinent to department budgets and various trades in the University. He said that the employees of the photoshops and the carpentry shops, who are on fixed salaries, complain bitterly that they do not get enough work to do from departments, while departments, who have work to be done, cannot have it done because of budgetary restrictions. He thought the result of this to be a zero sum gain and asked the Dean if he would see that something was done about the situation.

Dean Bertrand replied that that is an issue that has arisen over the past two years as, suddenly, they started calculating labour costs and charges were passed on to departments. He said that it is pure paper work but does not end up as such as far as departments are concerned. It is something that he has been talking about with the Vice-Deans and said that they would continue to try to do something about the problem.

The Dean was asked if he could explain why and how money was being saved by having the Convocations moved to Place des Arts.

The question was referred to the Registrar's representative who stated that it was less expensive because of overtime labour costs, and that the rental of the theatre was far less than the costs of having a company come in to drape the arena. Overall, there are considerable savings which are primarily labour costs. It was noted that there will be no receptions following the Convocations.

Dean Bertrand was asked if, at a meeting of the Classics Department on March 25th, he had said that no full-time replacements at all would be forthcoming for 1986/87 for a member planning to retire and that the faculty as a whole would have no say in determining whether Classics' viability was threatened by this reduction from four to three and that the opinion of former Dean Taddeo, the classicist, had no relevance in the matter.

The Dean replied that that was partly true. He said that it seemed to him that one of the problems that has arisen is based on a series of misunderstandings; first of all about the powers of Faculty Council, about the powers of CUFA and

about the powers of the Office of the Dean of Arts and Science, and in an effort to sort those out he had been trying to come to some understanding as to where they all fall. He said that one of the problems with what was just said, with what some other people had said and with the motion (letter dated April 3rd from Prof. Sanders) is that he had given no indication at any time that he wanted to dissolve the Classics Department. Simply, by saying that there cannot be a replacement for the 1986/87 year if, in fact, someone does retire does not imply anything other than for that particular year the Classics Department will be made up of a certain number of full-time members. The Classics Department members have the right, as do others, to then petition the Office of the Dean for a replacement for that position and that will be viewed in the context of the Faculty of Arts and Science priorities which is still in the process of being worked out. Therefore one of the reasons he had told the Chairman that he would not get a replacement for 1986/87 is because the priorities have not yet been worked out and until that is done it would be very difficult, if not impossible, to just automatically replace that particular position. To the second statement that was attributed to him the Dean replied that he had not said that, what he thought he had said, in fact, was that the Classics programme is not at all in question and that he firmly believes that the Arts and Science Faculty needs a Classics programme.

Asked if he was referring to a Classics programme as opposed to a department, the Dean replied that that may or may not be, that a department is just an administrative unit. He stressed that the programme is not in question.

It was asked if it might not be true that the judgement of a professional classicist, who was a former Dean, and the department who are the only professionals and who alone know how a programme survives might hold precedence over an administrative judgement of a Chair. The Dean's reply was that that was not necessarily so.

The Dean was then asked if he had told Prof. Sanders that he had no intention of bringing the question of the dissolution of Classics before Faculty Council since he knew very well that Council would not approve. He replied that he did not remember but that he might have said something like that. He said that he had no intention of dissolving the Classics Department, so did not know why he would want to bring it before Council.

One member pointed out that the Department could be dissolved by attrition if the number of faculty is reduced to two or three members making the Department no longer viable.

Dean Bertrand replied that there is a department in the University with only one faculty member and that the issue of what makes a department viable is hardly a question of numbers; it is a question of a variety of issues, including programmes and student enrollments. To the question of whether or not Classics could continue to function with one or two members he said it was an extremely debatable issue but not one to be debated at the Council in those terms. In order to straighten out two or three other myths, the Dean stated that indeed what he had said at the meeting referred to was that it seemed to him that for the coming year it might behoove the Classics Department to look around the Faculty of Arts and Science to see if there was not a member of another department capable of filling in and going on loan to that department and that he had received a very mixed response to that particular suggestion. He said that he also asked the Chairman of Classics, and as yet has not received the document, to outline the precise, exact courses that need to be offered in order to provide a classics major or honours, and said he would be happy to entertain, then, a look at how many part-time contracts will be required to fill those specific courses in addition to the full-time faculty members in the department. He then said that next year the Department should prepare an argument for him so he could entertain whether or not Classics needs a replacement. That, he said, is where things stand right now.

Dean Bertrand was asked if he did not realize when he had made the suggestion as late as March 25th that the Classics Department might possibly co-opt a member from some other academic department that the teaching schedules and programmes were already fixed and set for September and there would be virtually no possibility in succeeding in doing that.

To that inquiry, the Chairman said that he was far more optimistic about the abilities of people, in smooth and healthy negotiations, to work out those kinds of difficulties, particularly with the aid of Vice-Deans and others.

It was asked if it was known how many people on faculty are qualified and willing to go into Classics and secondly, if they are qualified and willing, who is going to take their places in the courses which they would be teaching in September.

To the first question, the Dean replied that that was not his particular problem to answer, he had offered Classics a possible solution and had assumed they were the ones who

would know better than he who might or might not be qualified and to whom they might want to talk. He responded to the second question by saying that if they find someone and it poses the kind of problem referred to, the Vice-Dean and he would have to look at the situation to see what the part-time budget looks like and see what they have to meet in terms of which department it is that is involved.

The Chairperson was questioned as to his not wanting to dissolve Classics, if it was not true that in his discussions with Prof. Sanders and in discussing the various departments which might absorb Classics, he had mentioned History and Modern Languages.

Dean Bertrand reiterated that he was firm about the idea that the Arts and Science Faculty needs a Classics programme. He said that he did not particularly care today to go into all the reasons why having a department causes a lot of difficulties for the people in Classics that could be eased if they were in a larger unit, but the answer to the question was that indeed those are the two departments that he thought of as being the most likely since also he had looked through the calendars from across Canada and discovered a number of Classical and Modern Languages departments or Classics and History departments.

The Chairman was asked if a member's interpretation was correct of Article 4403 of the Collective Agreement which says "that the Board has the right not to fill vacant positions in a department except when failure to fill a position threatens the viability of the programme, department, as determined by the Senate".

Dean Bertrand agreed and pointed to the "viability of the programme" which he said is not at all threatened at this time and has never been threatened. He added that that sentence is there precisely for that reason. He made reference to a statement further on in the Collective Agreement that says that it will require a two-thirds majority of the Senate to approve the various steps. Further on it states that if such action "will result in the reduction in the number of faculty", and he emphasized that no one is talking about reducing the number of faculty members. He added that he did not think that the article had anything to do with the particular problem at hand.

The Chairperson was asked to comment on the note which appeared in the budgetary projections concerning the cost of the move of the Economics Department to accomodate the Faculty of Commerce and Administration.

Vice-Dean Albert was asked to comment. He said that was

a proposal to move the Department out of the Hackett Building, where the members are not happy, but that most of the space changes at the moment remain in the realm of the possibilities depending on whether or not Quebec has the money to foot the bill for anything. He confirmed the idea that a department would not be moved without having been consulted on the matter.

6. Mandate and Membership of the Arts and Science Committee on the Status of Women (ASFC 86-3-D1)

The Chairman indicated that there were two issues at hand on the Committee on the Status of Women: a) the proposed mandate set out by the Ad Hoc Committee and b) the proposed composition of the committee, as well as a document distributed by Prof. Newsham concerning the mandate. The mandate of the committee was considered in a discussion that took place as if in the committee of the whole. Ms. Lapestolle was asked to outline the position of the Ad Hoc Committee.

Some of the points raised in the discussion follow:

Asked to comment on her document (ASFC 86-3-D4), Prof. Newsham said that she did not disagree with the content of the mandate, but with the ordering and the fact that the "what" and "how" were mixed up together. Also, she thought that it ought to be stated that the goal is to improve the status of women, and that the mandate should refer to the Faculty of Arts and Science.

It was said that the question of trying to distinguish between aims and means has gone back a long time and that they are not easily separated, and to try to develop a mandate in Council would be to set a precedent that would take up a great deal of Council's time. However, whether or not there is any priority implied by the number scheme, it was suggested that number V become number II, or else to add a statement indicating that the numbers do not mean anything. In reply, it was said that the only priority given was to the first statement.

Some members thought that to try to differentiate between the aims and methods of the mandate would tie the hands of the committee unnecessarily.

One of the members of the Ad Hoc Committee stressed that it was the feeling of the committee that the mandate ought to be kept as open as possible, but she supported the suggestion that the reference to the Arts and Science Faculty be added to the first point.

Exception was taken by some to the inclusion of the note below the composition of the committee "that at least a majority of the committee should be women." It was said that to identify committees as deliberately constructed on the basis of gender seems to be a reversal of the complaint that is being made that justifies the establishment of such a committee.

One member asked to have the word "suggestions" replaced with "recommendations" in the first line of section III, and to remove the word "important" from the second line of section IV.

The meeting moved back into regular session.

86-3-3 It was moved and seconded (Mullett/Gilsdorf) to adopt the mandate presented by the Ad Hoc Committee (ASFC-86-3-D1).

A number of editorial changes were agreed to: the words "to seek and" were removed from the first entry of the mandate, and the phrase "in Arts and Science" was added to the end of the same sentence; the word "suggestions" in II was changed to "recommendations", and the word "important" was replaced with "relevant" in the second line of IV; sections II and IV were interchanged and the numbering sequence adjusted accordingly.

The motion to approve the mandate as edited was voted on and it was carried.

86-3-4 It was moved and seconded (Gilsdorf/Mullett) to approve the membership of the committee.

The discussion that followed centred on the proportion of faculty compared with that of students and staff on the committee, and it was wondered why the full-time faculty was outnumbered. The view that there was a need for faculty members on the committee who are able to satisfactorily monitor the research procedures under which such studies are conducted was put forth. The reply given was that there are some very serious problems in the other constituencies and, even so, the faculty was given the largest single constituency on the committee.

Some members objected to the inclusion of the N.B. at the foot of the page.

86-3-5 It was moved and seconded (Petrie/Costanzo) that the N.B. be removed on the basis that if the situation were reversed, there would be almost universal condemnation of the idea that any committee should be reserved for a majority of men, precisely the idea that was addressed to necessitate the committee in the first place.

One member had a great deal of sympathy with the ideas that were expressed that this is a committee to redress or to deal with problems that many women have experienced in the University and, therefore, to have as its composition, a majority of women, is justified, but on the other hand, had a great deal of difficulty in reserving anything any time for any special group, and against any form of prejudice against anyone, whatever their sex, race, creed or anything else. She found, therefore, the N.B. difficult to accept but could accept the idea of a statement at the end that says "because of the particular mandate of this committee, it is expected that groups in making appointments will consider the importance of having women represented."

The question was called and the vote taken on the motion to eliminate the N.B. which resulted in a tie. The Chairman broke the tie by voting in favour of the amendment.

86-3-6 It was moved and seconded (Mullett/Crysler) to add a new N.B. which states that "As a guideline, because of the particular mandate of this committee, it is expected that the various constituencies in making their appointments will consider the importance of having women on the committee. Members will serve for one year (renewable)."

Vote: Carried

The proposed membership of the committee was voted on and was carried.

7. Establishment of Laboratoires d'Etudes sur les Matériaux Inorganiques/Laboratories for Inorganic Materials (ASFC 86-3-D2)

Prof. Pallen informed Council members that the reason for establishing the Laboratoires d'Etudes sur les Matériaux Inorganiques/Laboratories for Inorganic Materials as a unit was to grant it recognition in its contact with the outside world. He said that the unit has been granted approximately \$1.3 million to operate and to do research and is composed of people from the McGill Chemistry Department, Concordia Chemistry Department and the Faculty of Engineering and Computer Science. The awarding of the grant and application of the grant has established a responsibility and commitment on the part of the Government, the people who applied for the grant, as well as the University, and approval of the new unit will establish this kind of recognition.

Prof. Pallen made two corrections in the title of the unit changing the spelling of "inorganiques" and replacing "Inorganic Chemistry" with "Inorganic Materials".

It was asked why the title was given in the plural in French and in the singular in English. The Chairman replied that that was discussed in the Steering Committee meeting and it was thought that it might refer to an extension of it. He volunteered to find out why it was done that way. The general consensus was that the title should be plural in both cases.

One member wondered if the unit would cease to exist if the grant runs out. Vice-Dean Albert replied that it is expected that the laboratory should generate between one-half million and one million dollars worth of contract research within about five years, and if they produce what is expected of them in that time, it will be established as an ongoing laboratory. On the other hand if they cease to attract funds to operate, they ultimately could consider disbanding.

Asked if the Council would be asked to vote on the dissolution of the unit, Dean Bertrand said that in this particular case he suspected not, because if the money runs out there would be no *raison d'être* for the unit. He noted that it is neither a department nor a programme.

It was asked why this item was being considered by Faculty Council since other similar units were created by the Board of Governors and approved without being sanctioned by Council or Senate.

The Dean replied that the matter will be sent to Senate for its information and to the Board of Governors for approval, and the reason it was being done this way was because it is not just a unit of a department but that other elements of the University are involved as well. He added that the unit will report to the Dean of Arts and Science.

The motion was voted on and it was carried.

8. Notice of Elections to take place at the May meeting of Faculty Council (ASFC 86-3-D3)

Dean Bertrand invited the faculty to submit nominations for the elections to take place at the next meeting to his office or to Mona Osborne up until May 23rd.

The members were asked to note that two additional positions on the Board of Graduate Studies will have to be filled.

9. Other Business

No other business was raised.

10. Next meeting

The Chairman reported that although the next meeting is scheduled as an all day meeting, he did not expect that it would be. but set the start of the meeting for 9:30 a.m.

11. Adjournment

86-3-8 The meeting was adjourned at 3:15 p.m. (Gilsdorf/Goldsmith).